

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1076

MARTIN RUGAMBA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ROCKLEDGE BUS (TOUR), INC.; ROCKLEDGE BUS (TOUR) INC.
SUPERVISOR; MTA POLICE OFFICER 1; MTA POLICE OFFICER 2; MTA
BUS DRIVER; MTA TRAIN OPERATOR; AMTRAK 3 UNKNOWN AGENTS;
7-ELEVEN, INC.; 7-ELEVEN, INC. 2 UNKNOWN EMPLOYEES; DOES
1-20,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. George L. Russell, III, District Judge.
(1:15-cv-03948-GLR)

Submitted: June 23, 2016

Decided: June 28, 2016

Before MOTZ, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Martin Rugamba, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Martin Rugamba seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-47 (1949). Because the deficiencies identified by the district court may be remedied by the filing of an amended complaint, we conclude that the order Rugamba seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Goode v. Cent. Va. Legal Aid Soc'y, Inc., 807 F.3d 619, 623 (4th Cir. 2015); Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993).

Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED